UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/567,592 | 06/30/2006 | Jeffrey D. Hillman | 02-1037-1 | 1322 |
| 20306 7590 09/03/2009 MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | WARE, DEBORAH K | |
| 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1651 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/03/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/567,592 | HILLMAN, JEFFREY D. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | DEBBIE K. WARE | 1651 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE | L. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5,9-11,13-15 and 17-29 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-11,13-15,21-23 and 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5,17-20,24,28 and 29 is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to a solution and for the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to a solution and for the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to a solution and for the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to a solution and for the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to a solution and for the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to a solution and for the drawing to a s | <u>d 25-27</u> is/are withdrawn from conted. r election requirement. | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/5/09; 6/15/06; and 2/6/06. | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | nte | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-29 are pending.

Preliminary Amendments

The Preliminary Amendments filed November 4, 2008, and February 6, 2006, have been received and entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDSs) submitted have been received.

The submissions are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-3, 5, 17-20, 24, and 28-29, in the reply filed on June 5, 2009, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the groups are not independent and distinct from one another and have the same function. This is not found persuasive because the composition for carrying out the method of Group IV is different and distinct because the combination of steps does not require a lactate dehydrogenase-deficient strain as required of Group I. Also the dentrifice requires special features not required of the other groups and a food is not a dentrifice nor is Group I intended to be a food. Thus, these Groups do have different and distinct special technical features. However, it is possible that the claims can be rejoined upon indication of allowable subject matter.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Art Unit: 1651

Claims 9-11, 13-15, 21-23, 25, 26, and 27, are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on June 15, 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3, 5, 17-20, 24, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Since the microorganism is recited in the claims, it is essential to the invention recited in those claims. It must therefore be obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification or otherwise be readily available to the public. If the microorganism is not so obtainable or available, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 may be satisfied by a deposit of the microorganism. The specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the microorganism and it is not apparent if the microorganism is readily available to the public.

It is noted that applicants have deposited the organism but there is no indication in the specification as to public availability. If the deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by applicants, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific strain will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.801-1.809, applicants may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b) all restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer; and
 - (d) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

Applicant is directed to 37 CFR § 1.807(b) which states:

(b) A viability statement for each deposit of a biological material defined in paragraph (a) of this section not made under the Budapest Treaty on the

Application/Control Number: 10/567,592 Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure must be filed in the application and must contain:

- (1) The name and address of the depository; (2) The name and address of the depositor; (3) The date of deposit;
- (4) The identity of the deposit and the accession number given by the depository;
 - (5) The date of the viability test; (6) The procedures used to

obtain a sample if the test is not done by the depository; and

(7) A statement that the deposit is capable of reproduction.

Applicant is also directed to 37 CFR § 1.809(d) which states:

- (d) For each deposit made pursuant to these regulations, the specification shall contain:
- (1) The accession number for the deposit;
- (2) The date of the deposit;
- (3) A description of the deposited biological material sufficient to specifically identify it and to permit examination; and
- (4) The name and address of the depository.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3, 5, 17-20, 24, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims are rendered vague and indefinite for the recitation of the term "isolated" because it is unclear whether or not the term is intended to mean biologically purified. It is suggested to replace "isolated" with "biologically purified" in the claims. Overall the metes and bounds of the claims can not be determined.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,592 Page 6

Art Unit: 1651

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5, 17-20, 24, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0058575, cited on enclosed PTO-1449 Form.

Claims are drawn to a composition and method(s), therefore, comprising one or more strains of Streptococcus uberis.

EP teaches the same species to be comprised by the composition.

Hence the composition is anticipated by the teachings of the reference because it contains the identical microorganism.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 17-20, 24, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP, cited above, in view of Tagg et al, cited on PTO-1449 Form.

Claims are drawn to compositions and method therefore, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of S. oralis and S. uberis, and including optionally other bacteria, such as S. mutans.

EP is discussed above.

Tagg et al teach compositions and method therefore, wherein the composition comprises a mixture of S. oralis and S. uberis, and including optionally other bacteria, such as S. mutans. Note page 218, and see Table 1, and col. 1, lines 1-55.

The claims differ from EP in that S. oralis is not specifically disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the two bacteria of the cited prior art, EP and Tagg et al, to form a composition for treating the oral cavity and other disease treatments as claimed. Each of the bacteria are disclosed independently in the art to be useful for the same types of treatments and one of skill would have been motivated to select either one of these bacteria, including many other types of bacteria disclosed by the cited art. One of skill in the art would have expected successful results. Therefore, the claims are prima facie obvious over the cited prior art.

All claims fail to be patentably distinguishable over the state of the art discussed above and cited on the enclosed PTO-892 and/or PTO-1449. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected.

The remaining references listed on the enclosed PTO-892 and/or PTO-1449 are cited to further show the state of the art.

No claims are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,592 Page 8

Art Unit: 1651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE K. WARE whose telephone number is (571)272-0924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Deborah K. Ware/ Deborah K. Ware Examiner Art Unit 1651